

Serial Number: 09/607,568

Docket Number: 10004010-1

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1-16, 19-21, 24-26 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 5, 10, 13, 14, 19, and 24 have been amended, and claims 17-18, 22-23, and 27-28 have been canceled. Applicants request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-16, 19-21, and 24-26 have been rejected under 25 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,336,114 issued to Garrison (hereafter "Garrison") in view of the article entitled "Using Netscape II" authored by Mark R. Brown (hereafter "Brown"). A prima facie case of obviousness is established only when the prior art teaches or suggests all of the elements of the claims. MPEP 2143.03, *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 U.S.P.Q2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). For the reasons that follow, Applicants assert that the cited combination of references above fails to show or suggest all of the elements of claims 1-16, 19-21, and 24-26. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn. To begin, claim 1 as amended provides:

1. A system for authenticating a user, comprising:
a processor coupled to a local interface;
a memory coupled to the local interface; and
send logic stored on the memory and executable by
the processor, the send logic comprising:
logic to input a password associated with a
user;
logic to authenticate the password and to
obtain a FROM field identifier associated with the user; and
logic to lock the FROM field identifier into a
FROM field associated with a data transmission.

With respect to claim 1, the Office Action states:

"As per claims 1, 6, 11, 14, 15, 19, 20, 24 and 25, Garrison discloses a client with a processor (DSP) and memory (Disc) coupled to a local network (network interface), (col. 3, lines 53-65). Garrison discloses logic to input a password associated with a user, (col. 4, lines 28-29, col. 4, lines 4-8). Garrison discloses logic to authenticate the password (col. 6, lines 3-18). Garrison does not disclose a FROM field. Brown discloses authenticating a user with a password, (pg. 226, paragraph 1). Brown discloses obtaining a FROM field identifier and locking the FROM field identifier into a FROM field associated with data transmission, (Ray Gronberg Gronberg @ nando.net) associated with the user, (page 342, figure 13.3)." (Office Action, Page 2).

Serial Number: 09/607,568Docket Number: 10004010-1

Applicants respectfully disagree. Specifically, claim 1 includes logic to lock the FROM field identifier into a FROM field that is associated with a data transmission. In this respect, the inclusion of the FROM field identifier into a FROM field is performed when a data transmission is generated before it is actually transmitted. The FROM field identifier is "locked" in the sense that it cannot be manually changed by the user. In this respect, the FROM field identifier is obtained based upon the login information from the user. Brown fails to show or suggest such a concept.

Specifically, figure 13.13 of Brown simply shows a picture of an email that was received (actually it was an email that Ray Gronberg sent to himself). There is no logic that locks a FROM field identifier into the location shown in the screen. Rather, on page 338, when composing an email, a user inputs the email address to which the email is to be sent as set forth by Brown. In this respect, a user has carte blanche ability to enter any email address that they desire. There is no logic that obtains a "FROM field identifier" such as, for example, an email address or a user name that is inserted into the FROM field associated with the data transmission such as an email or facsimile transmission in a manner that does not allow a user to alter or otherwise modify such FROM field identifier.

In this respect, for publicly accessible data transmission devices such as networked multifunction peripherals, unscrupulous users are prevented from entering bogus FROM address information and sending illicit data transmissions under an assumed name. This may be problematic where such individuals scan and send profane materials and the like which may occur in hostile environments. Rather, Brown merely discusses a standard email system that does not provide for the capability of locking in a FROM address that is obtained by virtue of a user authentication as described.

Accordingly, Applicants assert that the cited combination of references fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants note that claim 6 and 11 include subject matter similar in scope with that of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 6 and 11 be withdrawn for the same reasons as with respect to claim 1 above.

Serial Number: 09/607,568Docket Number: 10004010-1

In addition, claims 2-4, 7-9, and 12 depend from claims 1, 6, and 11, respectively. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn as depending from claims 1, 6, and 11 for the reasons stated above.

In addition, claim 5 as amended herein states:

5. The system of claim 1, wherein the logic to authenticate the password and to obtain the FROM field identifier associated with the user further comprises:
logic to encrypt the password; and
logic to apply the password to authentication logic to verify the password and to obtain the FROM field identifier associated with the user from the authentication logic.

With respect to claims 5, 10, and 13, the Office Action states:

"As per claims 5, 10, and 13, Garrison discloses logic to encrypt the password (col. 5, lines 20-23). Garrison discloses logic to authenticate the user and password, (col. 6, lines 3-18). Garrison does not disclose a FROM field. Brown discloses a FROM field, (FIG. 13.13).

Applicants respectfully disagree. As set forth for example in claim 5 as amended, claimed is logic that applies the password to authentication logic to verify the password and to obtain the FROM field identifier associated with the user from the authentication logic. Applicants assert that a FROM field identifier is not obtained from authentication logic as described in Brown. Rather, Brown merely shows a standard email system in which a user enters a "From" email address. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 10 and 13 be withdrawn as including subject matter similar in scope with that of claim 5 discussed above.

In addition, claims 14, 19, and 24 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claims 17-18, 22-23, and 27-28, respectively. The Office Action has rejected claims 18, 23, and 28 under 36 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Garrison in view of Brown, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,742,769 issued to Lee (hereafter "Lee"). A prima facie case of obviousness is established only when the prior art teaches or suggests all of the elements of the claims. MPEP 2143.03, *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 U.S.P.Q2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). For the reasons that follow, Applicants assert that the cited combination of references fails to show or suggest the elements of at least claims 18, 23, and 28. Accordingly,

Serial Number: 09/607,568Docket Number: 10004010-1

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 14, 19, and 24 be withdrawn.

For example, claim 14 has been amended herein to include the subject matter of claims 17-18 and now states:

14. A system for authenticating a user, comprising:
a processor coupled to a local interface;
a memory coupled to the local interface; and
authentication logic stored on the memory and
executable by the processor, the authentication logic comprising:
logic to verify a password associated with a user
comprising logic to communicate with a domain controller to verify
the password and to obtain a secure identification tag associated
with the user from the domain controller; and
logic to obtain a FROM field identifier associated with
the user comprising logic to request the FROM field identifier from
an electronic mail server based upon the secure identification tag,
the FROM field identifier being associated with the secure
identification tag.

With respect to claim 18, the Office Action states:

"As per claims 18, 23, and 28, the Garrison Brown combination does not disclose requesting the FROM field from a server. Langford [sic] discloses requesting the FROM field from a server, (col. 7, lines 35-50)." (Applicants presume the name "Langford" was mistakenly used instead of "Lee").

Applicants respectfully disagree. In particular, at column 7, lines 35-50, Lee states:

"The processing system thus copies the recipient's email address (which was stored but not provided to the requesting user) into a "to" field; copies the sender's email address into a "from" field and a "reply-to" field; and puts into the "subject" field a phrase indicating that the source of the message is via this feature (step 178). In addition to this header, the processing system attaches an explanatory note for the recipient. Processing system 32 then causes the message to be routed to the recipient via a conventional email server 34 (step 180). The explanatory message to the recipient indicates that the sender is trying to communicate with the recipient; that the recipient should reply to the message only if the recipient wants to communicate with the sender; and that if the recipient replies, the recipient's actual email address is sent to the sender."

As stated above, Lee discusses the concept of sending email to a recipient whose address is restricted and must be obtained through specific steps disclosed therein. Nowhere does Lee show or suggest the concept of obtaining a FROM field

Serial Number: 09/607,568Docket Number: 10004010-1

identifier by requesting a FROM field identifier from an electronic mail server based upon the secure identification tag obtained from the domain controller where the FROM field identifier is associated with the secure identification tag. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn. Also, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 19 and 24 as amended be withdrawn as including subject matter similar in scope with claim 14. In addition, Applicants request that the rejections of claims 15-16, 20-21, and 25-26 be withdrawn as depending from claims 14, 19, and 24, respectively.

In addition, it is noted that claims 1 and 14 have been further amended to correct for an inadvertent error in that the local network is actually a local interface.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicants' response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. D'Aurelio
Reg. No. 40,977

D'Aurelio & Mathews, LLC
96 Church Street
Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44022
Phone: (440) 729-7450
Fax: (440) 729-7465